



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,766	09/17/2003	Kamiya Takuroh	242591US2	3841

  

22850	7590	04/18/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.		
1940 DUKE STREET		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		

  

EXAMINER	
CHARLES, MARCUS	

  

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3682	

  

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/18/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/663,766	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAKUROH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Marcus Charles	<b>Art Unit</b> 3682	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-20 and 22-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 21, 31 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to the submission filed 02-23-2008, which has been entered.

Claims 1-8 and 10-30 are currently pending.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. The request filed on 01-23-2008 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 10/663,766 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kayahara et al. in view of JP (04-226362) to Wieland. Regarding claim 1 and 21, in figs. 21-22 and 24/36 respectively, Kayahara et al. discloses a belt drive comprising a plurality of rollers (12, 123, 122, 125)/(22-25, as in fig. 36) including a driving roller (227)/(24, as in fig. 36)); a belt (221) (20a, fig. 36) configured to be tensioned by the rollers and to be driven by the driven roller (227)/(24, in fig. 36)); the driving roller is arranged adjacent to an outside body (761)/(100, fig. 36) that contacts the outer surface of the belt; note the item 33, is apparently an absorbing member that absorbed the movement of the transfer roller when the drive roller contacts the outside body. Kayahara et al. fail to disclose the absorbing member is arranged on the rotational axis

of the roller. JP (04-226362) discloses a roller drive having a damping roller (1-3) having a damping mechanism (32/41/42) that is arranged on the rotational axis of the roller. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Kayahara et al. so that the shock absorbing member is arranged on the rotational axis of the of the roller in view JP (04-226362) in order to reduce and balance wear and friction of the roller.

In claim 2, note the driving roller (227) is arranged opposite the outside body (761) across the belt.

In claim 3, note in fig. 21-22), the outside body is a cleaning blade (col. 36, lines 5-16).

In claim 5, note Kayahara et al. discloses the claimed invention.

In claim 6, note the recording medium (100).

In claim 7, note in fig. 36) the outside body is a recording medium (100).

In claim 8, note the rollers (42, fig. 24).

In claim 9, note the item 33, is apparently an absorbing member that absorbed the movement of the transfer roller when the drive roller contacts the outside body.

In claim 10, it is apparent that the resonant frequency of the absorbing member is different from periodic frequency of vibration caused by the contacts of the outer surface of the belt.

4. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kayahara et al. in view of JP (04-226362) as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Nallinger (2,724,377). The combination of Kayahara et al. and JP (04-

Art Unit: 3682

226362) do not disclose the absorbing member is a flywheel. Nallinger discloses a driving pulley (8) having a flywheel (7) on the rotational axis. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the device of Kayahara et al. so that the damping member is a flywheel in view of Nallinger in order to stabilized rotation of the roller.

***Citation***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note the prior art cited in attached PTO Form 892.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcus Charles whose telephone number is (571) 272-7101. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ridley Richard can be reached on (571) 272-6917. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/Marcus Charles/

*Marcus Charles*

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3682